UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,572	12/22/2003	Gerard H. ROUSSEAU	117421	1571
²⁷⁰⁷⁴ OLIFF & BERI	7590 02/06/2007 RIDGE, PLC.	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 19928			JIMENEZ, MARC QUEMUEL	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3726	
	·			
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		02/06/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 02/06/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction27074@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

\mathcal{C}	\
\backslash	ჟ
1)	0

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/707,572	ROUSSEAU, GERARD H.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Marc Jimenez	3726				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>21 Not</u> This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-14 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	from consideration.					
Application Papers		•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the order of the orde	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te				

Application/Control Number: 10/707,572

Art Unit: 3726

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

 Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Verhoest et al. (US5993082).

Verhoest et al. teach an oiling roller 12, a roller shaft 56,16,18 about which the oiling roller 12 rotates, and at least one cap unit disposed on an end face of the roller shaft 56,16,18. In figure 1 there are caps (for example 64) at the end faces of 18 and 16. Also, the center tube 56 could be considered a shaft 56 and the parts 16,18 could be considered end caps as well. Also in figure 2 there are also end caps 42,44 at the end faces of 16,18. Note the retainer 10. Regarding the limitation "oiling" and the cap "can" be squeezed, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

3. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Privin (US5406885).

Privin teach an oiling roller 226 or 236, a roller shaft 220 or 230 about which the oiling roller rotates, and at least one cap unit 240 or 242 disposed on an end face of the roller shaft.

Note the retainer 112. Regarding the limitation "oiling" and the cap "can" be squeezed, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either one of the following references: Shaefer (US2565743) or Liebelt et al. (US2563049).

Each of these references clearly show end caps on the ends of shafts in the figures.

Regarding the limitation "oiling" and the cap "can" be squeezed, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 3726

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyahara et al. (US5902653) in view of Verhoest et al..

Miyahara et al. teach an oiling roller assembly, comprising: an oiling roller 1; a roller shaft 2 about which the oiling roller 1 rotates; and at least one cap unit 3 disposed on an end of the roller shaft 2.

Miyahara et al. does not specifically disclose that the end caps are on the end face of the roller shaft.

Verhoest et al. teach a central tubular shaft 56 with end caps 18,16 on the end faces of the shaft 56. Alternatively, Verhoest et al. a tubular shaft assembly 56,18,16 with end caps 64 on the end faces of the shaft 18,16 (figure 1). Alternatively, Verhoest et al. teach end caps 42,44 on the end faces of the shaft (see figure 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided the invention of Miyahara et al. with end caps on the end faces of the shaft, in light of the teachings of Verhoest et al., in order to provide a means to mount the shaft.

Regarding the limitation the cap "can" be squeezed, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Art Unit: 3726

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Interviews After Final

9. Applicant note that an interview after a final rejection will not be granted unless the intended purpose and content of the interview is presented briefly, in writing (the agenda of the interview must be in writing) to clarify issues for appeal requiring only nominal further

Art Unit: 3726

consideration. <u>Interviews merely to restate arguments of record or to discuss new limitations will</u> be denied. See MPEP 714.13 and 713.09.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc Jimenez whose telephone number is (571) 272-4530. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Bryant can be reached on (571) 272-4526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-872-1000.

Art Unit 3726

MARC JIMENEZ PRIMARY EXAMINER

MJ 1-26-07